



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ARCHÆOLOGY.

---

Vol. IX.

APRIL-JUNE, 1894.

No. 2.

---

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF ART.

---

THE PERSONALITY OF ART.—In this essay, the word *Art* is not used in the most limited sense, that of the Formative Arts (Architecture, Sculpture, Painting), nor only, in the more extended sense, to include the Literary Arts (Language, Poetry, Music). Art is here conceived to comprise, beside these, the Social Arts, which are Philosophy, Religion, Government, from which the literary and formative arts derive their inspiration and their universal ideas, and to which they contribute material of more external and individual species. It is conceived that these three regions of art—the social, the literary, and the formative—constitute the personality of art, the spirit, the soul, and the body of its organization, presenting analogies to the human person, to man as constituted of spirit, soul, body—of Spirit or Mind (which is the sphere of universal consciousness-activity-life), of Soul, including Will (the sphere of individuality, the *Ego*), and of Body, the physical constitution (the sphere of material consciousness-activity-life). In this unified personality of art, the social arts govern the literary and formative arts, furnish them with general principles and ideal subjects for incorporation, and give to them a higher life and significance; while the lower arts contribute, to the higher, material for the incorporation and expression of their ideas on lower planes of thought. Through this personal constitution, there is, in artistic periods of Society, throughout the entire social organism, a complete permeation and circulation

of universal ideals, which constitute the vitalizing and unifying principles of the civilization of the period. This harmony and coöperation of the arts extends from philosophy to painting; and their comparative study under the light of analogy is one of the most fruitful sources of knowledge as to the ideal significance of the lower arts; for it is in the higher arts, where thought is expressed in language, that we are to find the clearest and most distinct presentation of the psychologic principles and the general ideas which rule and govern all original production in any given epoch, all that constitutes its creative work of inspiration and genius, as distinct from mere imitation, fantasy and reproduction. This integral unity and communion among the arts, arising in the presence of common sociologic principles and norms of civilization, establishes a most intimate family relationship between the arts of any given period, and makes them all contribute to the expression of a common social ideal. This is seen most clearly among artistic peoples and in the constructive periods of society, when the artistic nature is developed on all planes of the consciousness. One of the clearest examples of this is found in Greek civilization, which was artistic and ideal from top to bottom; and presented an intuitive experience of, and a self-sacrificing devotion to, universal social principles paralleled only by the early Christians in their complete surrender to religious ideals, and by the Hebrews and by the medieval Christians in their devotion to theocratic civilization.

**PLACE OF ART IN CIVILIZATION.**—Civilization personifies human experience in the tri-individuality of Art, Science, and Industry, which constitute the spirit, soul, and body of civilization, and cover the whole ground of man's intelligent production and occupation. Art, as the spirit of civilization, is the highest agent in the development of human consciousness-activity-life; it is either regenerative or degenerative, as it is the exponent of truth-good-beauty, or of falsehood-evil-deformity.

Art occupies that department of human thought and activity which relates to the discovery of the ideality of existence and the laws of the mental universe, and to the incorporation of this knowledge in sensible forms for the sake of the ideal principles which these forms signify and contain, and for the purpose of

communicating these ideal principles to man for use in his mental life and development, and in his relations with other minds. Art is thus distinguished (1) from Science, which investigates the physical universe in the acquisition of knowledge for practical use in the subjection of nature to man; (2) from Industry, which works for the sake of material utility, and as the means of livelihood, in the cultivation, organization, and distribution of the products of the material universe.

Art is, therefore, the highest individuality in that objective world which we call Society or Civilization; it is its spirit, its universal and ideal entity. It is constructed through the human consciousness in opposite ideals, and operates upon this consciousness in its development by regeneration and by degeneration. It involves the operation of the entire human mind from the highest to the lowest of its faculties, from their highest (supernatural) to their lowest (material) condition, and from both constructive and destructive points of view or genera of ideal. In every period of civilization art projects, in sensible and individual form, those universal ideas which rule in this period; and this externalization aids the internal development of the mind by the multiplication of particular forms incorporating these ideas in the various inter-related arts, from philosophy, the highest, to painting, the lowest. Thus, a general ideal will find expression in the greatest variety of forms which appeal to the entire organization of the mind, from the Reason and the Sentiment to the lowest forms of Intellect and Affection, Sensation and Instinct. This ideal will rule in the formation or modification of ontologic principles and the form of Philosophy, of religious principles and the form of the Church, of moral and political principles and the form of the State, of the principles of cognition and the form of education, of the domestic principles and the form of the family, of economic and industrial principles and the form of individual occupation and the conduct of life. This universal ideal thus circulates through the whole social fabric and the consciousness and life of man, constituting the causative agent in the history of any period.

**DISTINCTION BETWEEN ART AND NATURE.**—From claiming for art this high character and position, it is clear that we hold art to be

a product of man's creative intelligence, and oppose that view which sees in art nothing but an imitation or copy of nature: the latter view would take away from art all reason to exist, would ignore all genius or creative power, all originality of conception, all possibility of progress in the race. The fundamental reason why art is not a copy of nature is, that concrete nature presents opposite ideals, laws, and phenomena in confusive conflict, and that it is one of the most important functions of art to separate, individualize, and distinctly present the opposite ideal realities which are behind the sensible appearances, in order to correct the deceptive and confused appearances of this nature, and to use them in the representation of the ideals of the mind. In every work of art, from landscape-painting to philosophy, nature is used as material, but only as it is transformed into artistic unity with the ideal in the mind of the artist, which is the primary ground and cause of the work of art; and the art consists in the reality of this incorporation of the ideal in actual form so as to express it by means the most clear, simple and direct; whether it be an ideal of beauty or deformity.

Even in landscape-art, which is one of the lowest forms of art, it must be claimed that art is higher than nature by reason of the addition of the element of mind, which raises the work of the artist above the mindless nature which is suggestive to him in his work, and furnishes him with external material. Every work of landscape-art is an ideal composition in both form and color. In many cases, the exact reproduction of the form and especially of the colors of nature would be ludicrously inartistic. The real artist, who takes a subject from nature, reconstructs it into artistic form and color, rejects non-essential elements, using only such parts as aid in the clear presentation of the ideas which this natural scene or object is used to express—because everything that does not aid in this artistic expression is an obstacle, an impediment, and must be removed from the work of art. If it be a work of beauty and congruity (even if it be only picturesque), all features that interfere with, and those which do not aid in, the symmetrical proportion of the parts and between the form and the idea must be either discarded or reconstructed. This applies to all works of art, from philosophy to painting—it is an artistic

dogma. What does a mere imitator or copyist know of such creative work, or those who think, with him, that copies of nature are works of art? Nevertheless, many an artist, unconscious of his mental process, will think that he is copying nature, when nature is merely suggestive to his creative faculty.

**PHILOSOPHY OF ART.**—The philosophy of art deals, primarily, with the opposite principles of reality, which are the archetypes of relative existence; secondarily, it deals with the works of art which really represent these primary principles in persisting typical forms of thought: all the rest of pseudo art-work belongs either to industry or to the rubbish-heap of art; and it is by far the greater part of so-called art that belongs there, as the waste always present in the natural world. *Æsthetic Science* should present art in both its theoretic and its practical aspects, and offer a conception of the principles of art (both objective and subjective) which may be useful in the interpretation of its phenomena. It should comprehend (1) a statement of the ontologic archetypes of æsthetic principles\* and their psychologic types in the human mind; (2) a definition of art, and a conception of its place as a factor in civilization; (3) a conception of the genera and species of art-ideals, which are the psychologic causes in the construction of its works—including a statement of the classes and species of ideas for which we are to look in works of art, and a conception of the faculties of the mind by which these works are constructed and appreciated. (4) *Æsthetic Science* must present laws of classification and of the historic development of art which shall be a guide in the comparative study of its generic and specific ideals, of its particular examples, its schools, and its historic periods; recognizing the validity of every species of art that persistently reproduces its kind, and is therefore to be included in the history of art. The philosophy of art should conceive the different art-ideals, present their distinctive character and actual operation, and estimate their relative value according to a universal ideal standard, and by this means give to the observer a

\*The ontologic foundation of Beauty and Deformity in primordial Being and Nonbeing is presented in Parts I and II of *Christian Philosophy* (Princeton, A. L. Frothingham, publisher), and reference to these chapters is necessary to the comprehension of the ontologic basis of the Philosophy of Art.

universal and disinterested point of view from which to judge and characterize the varied multitude of its works: it should teach him how to look at works of art from a point of view above the conflict of different ideals and the limitations of his personal preference, and thus to guard against the evil influence of false and immoral art.

The Philosophy of Art must reach the heights above these contending ideals and show the natural relation and succession of these types of thought in the human mind and in the order of human society. It is only by this means that thought can be redeemed from the chaos of conflicting ideals, from the limitations of a partial standpoint and the deceptive judgments of individual opinion and preference, from the instability of an ever-changing free-thought or pseudo-rationalism and the seductive gratification of free-feeling or licentiousness which is associated with it. Such help is much needed at the present time, when the use and study of art are becoming so general, and when the old authorities and landmarks of judgment and of taste are disregarded by the larger number. Confusion and license reign over a democratic civilization of exaggerated individualism, which seeks only pleasure, and too often finds it either in a vicious sensationalism and meretricious realism, or in a fanciful and effeminating idealism; by which the artist satisfies both the licentious taste that demands the production of such works and the commercial motive, which too often leads him to give rein to his technical power in the production of works that conform to an anti-Christian, an immoral, or a fantastic standard.

Writers on art usually write from some partial point of view, expressing some prejudice or preconception. Works on the philosophy of art are more often written in the interest of an individual philosophic ideal, and quite apart from any experience of works of art or any ability to realize them; sometimes they are written from a fanciful or fantastic experience. Histories of art and essays are written at best from a very external point of view, and to support some personal prejudice; often according to a simply literary method which enables the intellectual artisan to write about everything, as well without as with any real knowledge of the subject. The most common historic method is to

regard the great bulk of works of art as unsuccessful attempts to attain the type which the writer or his time prefers; instead of concluding that every species of art that persistently reproduces its kind is to be included in the natural history of art, and that it is the business of the real investigator to study every kind, and to attempt to conceive what psychologic cause and condition led to its production—to conclude that it had a meaning and try to find out what it means; not, because he does not understand it and does not like it, to attempt to brush it away with the cheap phrase of a partial standpoint: "It was a failure; they thought that they thought, but it was not thinking." This point of view recognizes the validity of only that species which is individual to it, being utterly lacking in that universal and artistic faculty of the mind which is able to conceive a more or less extensive group of species quite beyond the limitations of the individuality of the person.

It is not a real philosophy of history (but asophy or foolishness) which leaps from Aristotle to Descartes, from Origen to Schleiermacher and Hegel, from Euripides to Dante, from Praxiteles to Donatello, from Apelles to Raphael, from the age of Pericles to the Renaissance of Paganism of the fifteenth century. It is a Pagan consciousness which claims to do this, ignoring Christianity and Christian civilization. This standpoint is either unable to perceive and realize, or is antagonistic to, the social principles and historic laws of the Christian era. A philosophy of history cannot claim to exist unless it explain the Christian era as a part of history, and even explain the distinct periods and successive ideals of this era.

The time is past when people of true culture could claim to reject any historic species of art because it failed to correspond with a current ideal or with the limitations of the individual preference. Neither æsthetic science nor true taste can be founded on a temporary ideal and the taste of the time; or on the authority of individual opinion, taste, and preference; or on spontaneous and unreasoning judgment—no matter how innately artistic or highly refined and cultivated may be the individual nature.

Neither can æsthetic science be founded on theory alone, no matter how wonderful it may be, either in words or in ideas. A



theory which transcends the actual world of art, and separates itself from actual human consciousness, is without reason to exist. Science, in order to exist, must be founded on a rational synthesis of ideality, reality, and actuality: it must explain the facts, and all the facts, of art-history; it must show art to be integral to civilization, as well as show the relation of art to the manifestation of the integral principles of the mind: all this it must do, or it is not science but nescience.

History shows us that, in the development of a people, the prevalence of an advanced culture in the literary and formative arts has been attended or followed by national and individual degeneration—a degeneration of social institutions, of mental standards, and of individual character, accompanied by luxury of life, laxity of morals, and effeminacy of manners. In other words, history shows that the refinement produced by or attending an advanced æsthetic culture is enervating and unhealthy, is an evil, not a good, and is followed by a rapid degeneration in all the arts. This observed fact has appeared to furnish a ground for the opinion that art is integrally bad, and that its entire influence is to be characterized as demoralizing—an error arising in the inability to separate between its opposite generic principles (between sublimity and the horrible, between beauty and deformity, between the picturesque and the grotesque); and in the failure to distinguish its higher from its lower ideals and standpoints of consciousness, and to attribute to each its specific individuality and mental value.

It has become usual to contemplate art as having qualities of only one genus, as being the exponent of beauty alone; in fact, *beauty* and *art* are used by most writers of the day as equivalent terms. Art, therefore, is claimed by them to be intrinsically elevating and purifying in its causes and effects; and the prevalence of æsthetic culture, even in its merely technical and decorative forms, irrespective of the ideas involved in it, is by many held up as the highest good. We purpose to show that art may be and has been corrupting and debasing, as well as purifying and elevating; that destructive and demoralizing principles and ideals, as well as those which are constructive and moral, are to be found incorporated in art; and that, in certain epochs, these destructive

principles and ideals are to be seen operating, as degenerative social causes, in all the arts from philosophy to painting, and in all departments of human consciousness—the religious and moral, the intellectual and affectional, the social and domestic, and even the industrial.

History shows us that the general ideal of each period appears first in the philosophic or social arts (Philosophy, Religion, Government), passes into the literary arts or arts of expression, and finally becomes incorporated in the formative arts or arts of design. Consequently, degenerative formative and literary art is but the expression of degenerative social principles in philosophy and religion and politics already established in power, and at work in the attempt to found destructive civilization.

The original ideal of any epoch, as distinguished from its inherited ideals and its reproductive and imitative experience, constitutes the productive principle of the new spirit which every age has, though the greater part of the work of the age be merely imitative or reproductive. In order, then, to judge of the original work of any epoch, of any new departure (that which makes its significance), we must first determine the nature of the artistic principle and creative psychologic agent at work in this production; and this will show on what road this epoch is advancing—whether it be the road of health and regeneration, or the road of disease and degeneration: for there are but these two roads of advance. The fact that any system of ideas prevails throughout a community—is active, militant, profusely productive—does not prove that these are manifestations of healthy mental activity. Evidences of disease and degeneration, especially if these be deeply seated, do not readily show themselves to casual or external observation: it is only by philosophic analysis of the internal principles at work as the mental causes of the artistic effects, that we can penetrate below the surface, and get at the real social significance of any period.

We claim, then, that art, like everything else in this world, has its false-evil-deformed genus as well as its true-good-beautiful genus (both being real art), and that the constructive Reason and Sentiment are continually calling on us to reject the false-evil-deformed, and to choose the true-good-beautiful. A trusty

guide to aid in this choice is especially needed to controvert the delusive assertion of that school of writers on art who proclaim the false gospel of "art for art's sake," started in our century by Schiller, and perverted by his sensual followers, who would separate art from morality—often for the purpose of infusing into artistic forms an immoral content. With Schiller (*Æsthetic Letters*, XXII) it was a philosophic dogma, *that by the form the master abolishes the subject*. The sensual school of writers identify the technical element with art, and claim that the artistic technical form, irrespective of its ideal content, ranks the work of art as a cultivating agent, and that the false and evil ideal content is to be either accepted or ignored by the cultivated for the sake of the art-technique, which is really the material element only. This leads them to defend the artistic theatre as a whole—the moral or immoral content does not count; culture looks only at the artistic technique of origination by the author and of interpretation by the actor. This position leads to the defence of technically artistic fiction, even if it present the realism of beastly humanity, artistic sensualism, and devilry of all sorts. It leads to the defence of the representation of nude physical beauty, on the ground that what is not permitted in actual life, may be represented by realistic art, and redeemed from the evil of sensualism by the purifying influence of art.

A philosophy of art is needed also to refute the claims of the ideal school of the horrible, of deformity, of the comic and the grotesque, which correlative æsthetic principles it would substitute for and identify with their opposites, sublimity and beauty and the picturesque. This school would make itself to be a social regenerator instead of a degenerator, and would call itself true because it is real. Finding in humanity this idealism of imperfection, it claims that to represent it realistically is to produce an art that is a true elevator of the race—thus following the ideal reasserted in our time by Goethe, which would regenerate and save man through the experience of evil. If evil were always clad in garments of darkness and deformity, it would be easy to detect; but the most dangerous attacks of evil on human virtue are insidiously made under the stolen garments of light and beauty, and one has to learn to detect the internal and ideal deformity and

immorality of the most seductive forms of sensual beauty, which appeal to our defective human nature, and offer gratification to its evil desires under forms which have been accepted in the so-called good society of the epoch. In every individual there are a mother Eve and a father Adam ready to be seduced by the serpent if he be clad as an angel of light. The temptation of a seductive charm is addressed to inborn sensualism; and, if not guided by reason or by true forms of sentiment, the soul is in danger of yielding itself to the sensual-beautiful, the seductive Circe of art, which changes its lovers into swine.

The personal-psychologic question with regard to a work of art becomes: Does it elevate the mind or edify the soul? Not, does it suggest new thought? but, is this thought constructive or destructive, is it elevating or degrading? Not, does it profoundly affect the feelings? but, what is the quality of the feeling excited? Works of art are too often estimated by the amount of originality and talent they show, by their psychologic intensity and effect on the feelings through sympathy; instead of being judged by the quality of the experience and by the relative value of the faculty of the mind and the emotion of the soul to which they appeal.

If human nature were perfect, harmonious in its want, unitive in its life, natural selection by instinctive want might be a true law of life; though, even in that case, it would be true only by union with and subjection to true reason. But human nature is imperfect and discordant, has affinities for both truth and falsehood, for both good and evil, for both beauty and deformity—has capacities for degradation as well as for elevation, and is always moving in the one direction or in the other. Furthermore, in many natures (from both heredity and environment) the affinity and capacity for falsehood-evil-deformity is more powerful than that for truth-good-beauty—in some cases even has possession of the nature. We must therefore insist on rational judgment *versus* feeling; for, though feeling may suggest the want or inclination, reason must determine whether it be a constructive or a destructive want that claims to be gratified. When, as the law of life, natural selection by instinctive want takes the place of the judgment of the reason, the dictates of religious and moral sentiment, and the conscious choice between right and wrong princi-

ples, the individual is obeying the command of a spontaneity which may be the destroyer of his life. We are familiar with the destructive manifestation of the nutritive and sexual instincts, which, by their unbridled gratification, destroy so many physical natures, but we do not so readily recognize the destructive power of that craving for literary and social stimulants which destroy the vital functions of the mind and will by a more subtle and deeper way of working.

True appreciation of art can exist only when the judgment is guided by a real knowledge of the artistic principles which operate in the production of the forms of art, and by a knowledge of the laws which regulate its history. This guide is æsthetic science, or the philosophy of art. This science must be comprehensive in its field of vision, and should ascend above the limitations of individual preference to a universal and disinterested point of view from which to characterize, classify, relate, and explain all those types of art which have vindicated their right to exist and their psychologic relation with man, by their establishment and historic succession, as the embodiment of the æsthetic consciousness and productive power of their epoch. This science must teach us to qualify and distinguish each one of the principles of art: to distinguish Sublimity from its opposite, the Horrible or Terrible, Truth-Good-Beauty from Falsehood-Evil-Deformity, the Picturesque from the Grotesque, so that we may detect the presence of these principles in works of art, and see into the real nature and psychologic significance of the representation by getting at its ideal content. It must teach us to separate these generic principles of artistic reality into their opposite spheres of ideal causality, and to recognize the specific limits and boundaries of the distinct principles in each of these opposite spheres: placing on one side the constructive principles of art, Sublimity, Beauty, the Picturesque, which constitute the spirit, the soul, and the body of constructive ideality, and include the ideas of congruity and unity, law and order, harmony, rhythm and repose, grandeur, simplicity and purity, wisdom, love and constructive power; and placing on the opposite side the destructive principles of art, the Horrible, Deformity, the Grotesque, which constitute the spirit, the soul, and the body of destructive ideality, and

include the ideas of incongruity and diversity, lawlessness and chaos, discord and monstrosity, duplicity, obscenity and mere-tricity, guile, hate and destructive force. It must recognize the intimate relation (both normal and abnormal) between Sublimity, Beauty and the Picturesque, as coöperative principles in constructive art (as well as the perverted forms in which they appear in epochs of decline), and the intimate relation between the Horrible, Deformity and the Grotesque, as coöperative principles in destructive art, which includes all those forms of Tragedy and the Horrible, and of Comedy and the Ludicrous, which are shown to be the product of coöperative æsthetic principles.

Æsthetic science must teach us, also, to recognize the different art-ideals which originate in different classes of human consciousness and conceptions of primary causality, and constitute distinct points of view, under one of which every work of art is to be classified, because this ideal characterizes its significant content, and the ideal point of view under which the artist worked in his construction of it. We must distinguish the point of view from which the ideal of Deformity is presented—whether from its own standpoint or from that of Beauty. That art which presents Deformity from its own standpoint is destructive, because its point of view is false and evil—it knows neither itself truly nor its opposite Beauty, but identifies itself with Beauty. That art which presents Deformity from the standpoint of Beauty is constructive, because its point of view is true and good—it knows itself, and sees and truly knows its opposite, Deformity, which it presents in all its detailed opposition of falsehood-evil-deformity. The art of Beauty sometimes presents itself alone, sometimes presents itself and its opposite, Deformity, but for the purpose of separating it from Beauty, and presenting Beauty and Deformity as opposite ideals. We see this in all dualistic systems of theology, in the Bible, in early Christian art, in the epics of Dante and Milton. In the history of Christian civilization, the ideal of Deformity has gained power in the domain of art, and the ideal of Beauty has become perverted and finally denied by a monistic idealism, founded on Deformity, which reigns in art from Philosophy to Painting, in the incorporation of the

æsthetic principles of horrible and grotesque Deformity, coöperating with a perverted naturalistic and materialistic beauty.

The philosophy of art is not in the interest of theoretic truth alone, but is also a practical guide in the affairs of life. It furnishes a basis for historic judgment of the social principles at work in all periods of civilization, it being impossible to interpret history without a knowledge of the ideal principles which are the psychologic causes in its production. It is necessary as a guide in the separation between opposite orders of art—between the art which is true and constructive, elevating and purifying, and the art which is false and destructive, depraving and corrupting. It aids to controvert the different forms of destructive thought: (1) it controverts the technic school of sensual realism, whose motto is “Art for art’s sake,” and who would make art consist in perfection of technique, which is made to cover a multitude of sins in the ideal content; (2) it controverts the false gospel of the pessimistic and nihilistic-supernatural ideal, which is the destructive factor in civilization; (3) it controverts the current pantheistic, naturalistic, and material theories of philosophy and religion and politics, which dominate all forms of art, especially the claims of the critical, logical and pseudo-rational intellect in its assertion of the natural ideal, and the claims of the realistic and technic intellect in its assertion of the material ideal; both of which combine with the destructive-supernatural ideal in a common enmity to Christian Theism and the constructive-supernatural ideal of Christian civilization.

**ÆSTHETIC DUALISM.**—The chief obstacle to modern æsthetic science is that it has been founded on a monistic philosophy, and therefore recognizes Beauty to be the only art-principle, attempting to explain all kinds of art as momenta or determinations of this one principle—Beauty. The evident presence, in works of real art, of deformity or ugliness, of the horrible, and of the comic or ludicrous, has led German theorists of our century, and their followers, to the monstrous conclusion that ugliness, the terrible, and the ludicrous, together with the beautiful, are particular manifestations or successive momenta of a pseudo-universal principle of beauty. This recognition is not from the point of view of a merely superficial inconsistency, but is in the interest of a

false idealism, which aims to confound opposite ideas and things in a principle of chaotic identity—the principle which is at the basis of false idealism in all ages. These theorists are preternaturally blind to the proposition, so clear to ordinary minds, that a principle which evolved such opposites as the beautiful, the deformed, the terrible, and the ludicrous, could not be named *Beauty*, neither could they be defined under any one term, for even the word Identity implies and involves the opposites identified.

That all art is not the art of Beauty will be seen by the slightest reflection on æsthetic law. Beauty is the symbol of unity and harmony and order, and it demands Congruity as its law—symmetrical proportion and consistency among the ideas represented and between the elements of the art-form, as well as between this form and the ideal to be signified and expressed by it. But there is also an art of Deformity that is the symbol of diversity and license and chaotic discord, which demands Incongruity as its law—unsymmetrical proportion and inconsistency between the parts of the art-form and between the ideas expressed and the form of expression, as well as an incoherence and distortion and absurdity in the ideas themselves—such is the art of the Horrible and of the Comic. Discord and license and disorder rule in this art of Deformity, and constitute its very being; and this lawless art is so predominant that it is quite usual to characterize all art and all beauty (which are treated as equivalent terms) as the child of a so-called free but really licentious fancy.

The most casual observation of its works<sup>r</sup> shows that art is not the representation or manifestation of beauty alone; in fact, it is oftener the representation of deformity, either side by side with and opposite to beauty (in the same work) or as a sole ideal; and it is usually the deformity that is the more real, and therefore the more artistic. The tragedies of Aischylos and Shakespeare, are they not art? The *Inferno* of Dante and of Milton, of Jakob Böhme and of Swedenborg, of Luca Signorelli and of Michel Angelo, the Medusa of Leonardo da Vinci—they surely are art; but who could say that they are representations of beauty? It is the reality of their representation of spiritual deformity, death and disorder, depravity and hate that makes them great works of art; and as such they are opposite to beauty, the essence of which



is spiritual life and order, purity and love. The value of these great works of art consists in their artistic reality, in the complete success attained in the incarnation of their idea; not in beauty of idea, for the ideas thus presented with artistic reality are ideas of deformity.

It is the same with that realm of art which is so intimately related to the imperfect side of our nature—the Grotesque, the Ludicrous, the Comic. It is real art, but it is founded on the law of incongruity, of falsehood-evil-deformity, and so often appeals to our enjoyment of obscenity and meretricity, of *double entente* and violent contrasts, as we see them in the great works of Shakespeare and a host of artists of the same type. All this art comes under the law of Deformity, for it is opposite to the congruity, simplicity and purity, the grandeur and elevation which belong to Beauty. In the art of painting, we might cite the Early Dutch School, which presents, in its greatest masters, examples of vulgar obscenity and meretricity, executed with complete mastery of idea, form, and color. This is an art which “holds up the mirror” to the vulgar, obscene, and meretricious type of human nature with a reality and mastery equalled only by some of Shakespeare’s most famous comedies; and it gives a much clearer expression of ideal Deformity than do the nudities and refined meretricity of idea of the French School of our time and its imitators, which work from the same æsthetic principle.

It is, therefore, not science, but confusion of thought, to say, as do many German philosophers, that the horrible and the sublime, the ugly and the beautiful, the satirical and the ridiculous, are momenta or particular forms of a pseudo-beauty—such a statement is of the extremest irrationality, and is impossible to true thought. It is like saying that evil is a particular form or manifestation or momentum of good, falsehood of truth, the infernal of the divine; that the Devil is a particular form of God, darkness of light, death of life, etc. Some writers are so vague in their thought, and some are such devotees of confusive thought, that they cannot see that artistic reality in the presentation of ideas of deformity does not constitute beauty, and they therefore rank such works as phenomena of beauty. A good psychologist should at once recognize the opposition between the ideas of Beauty and thos

of Deformity from the opposite nature of his own experience, because opposite ideas appeal to opposite faculties of the mind and opposite emotions of the soul, and, in general, produce opposite conditions of consciousness. Ideas of Sublimity and Beauty elevate and expand the mind and soul to their highest possibilities of experience: ideas of Horrible Deformity depress and paralyze the mind and soul with terror: ideas of Grotesque Deformity (including Wit and the Ludicrous) appeal to the lower side of our nature, contract the mind and soul to their lowest possibilities of experience, and excite to conscious activity its (perhaps) dormant depths of imperfection.

The subjective testimony of our nature proves the existence of these opposite genera of art. We perceive within us two natures—one, the perfect side of ourselves (the angel in us), to which appeals the art of Beauty and Congruity, of purity and simplicity, of elevation and grandeur and repose, of creative wisdom and love and power: the other nature, the imperfect side of ourselves (the demon in us), to which appeals the art that presents the terrible and destructive forces of supernatural existence, of man, and of nature, the art of Deformity and Incongruity, of Wit and the Ludicrous, with their false and impure and malevolent elements. The Dionysiac and Erotic phrenzy, the Silenic and Satyric beastliness, represented in Greek sculpture and vase-painting, cannot be denied artistic reality in a directness of representation of the ideas of deformity and grotesque. We deny the assertion, that Greek art was characterized by beauty alone, with its attributes of harmony, serenity, repose, purity and simplicity, because Greek art and all art is subject to the law of duality of ideal, and the law of historic degradation. The Greek consciousness was in an especial manner dualistic, as was the idealism of all antiquity: the religion of Babylonia and Egypt, of Assyria, Persia and Greece, and all polytheistic religions, divided their divinities into opposite camps, the supernal and the infernal, and their art, being founded on this dualistic theogony, represented opposite ideals and psychologic attributes. The constructive and theistic period of Hellenic civilization is distinctly dualistic. We find opposite orders of mythology and divinities, opposite art-ideals and types of social law, even opposite Greek races, as permanent represen-

tatives of these types. It is in the scientific and humanistic period of Hellenic history that the monistic principle appears and produces that confusion in myth and art-type of divinity, that inversion of ideal content and confusion of opposite ideals, which characterize all degenerate and destructive periods; presenting the same succession of types of consciousness that we see in Christendom.

If we recognize Sublimity and Beauty to be real æsthetic principles and causes of artistic production, the recognition of artistic duality is a necessary consequence: that is, we must recognize Deformity as a real principle of art and cause of artistic production. Deformity is not defective Beauty, it is the opposite to Beauty. Beauty, with its inseparable elements Truth and Good, cannot alone be the agent in art, as we find it, including as it does the Horrible, the Deformed, the False, the Evil, the Impure, the Grotesque, the Comic, the Ridiculous. If the universe of art be conceived to be produced or governed by one principle, and that the principle of Beauty and Perfection, there would be nothing in art (from Philosophy to Painting) but Perfect Unity, Symmetry, Order, Sublimity and Beauty. The very idea of Beauty is contradicted by conceiving it to include implicitly its opposite, Deformity, and all its servants of imperfection, which in certain periods are the agents in the bulk of artistic production. If any principle or entity be conceived to evolve its opposite, it cannot be truly named; for its definition should include the possibility of this evolution and the primary qualities of the thing evolved. If the Sublime can evolve the Horrible, or Beauty can evolve Deformity, either by diminution, defect, absence, privation, or as its manifestation, self-revelation, actuality, or as one of its momenta, then what is termed sublimity and beauty is falsely named, and the posit is denied by its own implication. The art of real Beauty is always true and good, and true art is always good and beautiful. Where truth and good are found, beauty must be present as the higher and constructive third. Some writers have made the artificial distinction between truth and beauty, that Science is the exponent of truth, and Art of beauty; but the truth of Science is of an order different from the truth of Art; and it is either a licentious or a fictitious beauty that has not truth for its co-worker.

Every work of art, as the condition of individuality, must include as its ideality either the co-active unities, truth-good-beauty, or the co-active diversities, falsehood-evil-deformity. As these tri-une idealities are spiritual opposites, we cannot, in any work of real art, find them combined in a mixed form. A pseudo-beauty which is not true and good must belong to the art of deformity. A work of art with an immoral idea is deformed, whatever false garment of the beautiful it may put on—it is deformity in beauty's perverted form, which makes the falsehood worse because more deceptive. A principal reason for error on this point is the misconception of truth by identifying it with reality; whereas falsehood-evil-deformity are as real as truth-good-beauty: they are opposite realities, and nothing in art, from philosophy to painting, can be really understood without knowing this reality of opposites, and applying the knowledge in the interpretation of phenomena. In all the works of the Most High, "Life is set against Death, and Good is set against Evil," for He placed, in the creation, images of death and evil as well as images of life and good, so that the invisible nonentities of the Not-god might be understood by the things that are made, as well as the invisible things of "His eternal power and Godhead"; for Jehovah created darkness and evil as well as light and peace (*Isaiah*).

In this probationary state of existence man is called upon to choose which ideal he will serve. He must serve, but he cannot serve two masters; and these opposite masters are offered to him with the command: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil;" "choose you this day whom ye will serve." This duality of masters obtains in the other forms of art as well as in Religion, and we must be able to intelligently distinguish and choose between them. If one choose for his master (with eyes open and for indulgence of personal inclination) the prince of darkness and sensuality, let him acknowledge that such is his act, and not pretend to see, in the deadly and sensuous images of Satan, the likeness and image of the Living God.

**PSYCHOLOGY OF ART.**—One of the chief obstacles to a philosophy of art has been the lack of a comprehensive science of mind which shall provide for and explain the different historic and persisting types of consciousness, thought, and art-ideals. An ade-

quate psychology, or science of mind, is indispensable to the study of art and the intelligent analysis of its works. *Æsthetic* science must be conceived in harmony with psychologic science (which is its subjective basis), and be carried along on parallel lines with this science, and even as a part of it, in order to present the subjective side of art, and to establish the relative value of the different departments of artistic experience. Without this scientific knowledge of the human mind, there cannot be a true philosophic judgment of works of art; for this psychologic knowledge is the first condition of this judgment in its determination of the comparative value, dignity, and rank of the work, by establishing the place, in the mental order, of the faculty to which belong the ideal content and the construction and appreciation of the work of art. The species of artistic beauty or deformity to which any work of art belongs must be related to that psychologic species of beauty or deformity in the various departments of the mind which is the psychologic cause in its production, and the faculty by which others than the artist observe, recognize, and appreciate its artistic quality and ideality.

According to our psychologic system, the general divisions of the Mind are (1) the Reason, which sees the universal ideas of Being, Nonbeing, and Becoming; (2) the Sentiment, which is intuitive and conceptive of the supernatural relationships of man; (3) the Intellect and Affection, which constitute the sphere of Thought and Feeling: and these three regions personify the mind, or constitute its spirit, soul, and body, in the normal condition of which the body is subject to and productive from the soul, and the soul to and from the spirit; while each of these regions is dualistic in its constitution, *i. e.*, is intuitive and conceptive of both truth-good-beauty, and falsehood-evil-deformity, is both constructive and destructive. We find, in the Reason at the summit of the mind, opposite generic principles; on the one side, Truth-Good-Beauty; on the other, Falsehood-Evil-Deformity; and these stand for opposite universal ideals or genera of vision, each of which becomes distinguished into many species as it becomes ensouled by the Sentiment, and incorporated by the Intellect in Thought. Thus, we find the Universal Beauty and Deformity of the Reason; the Philosophic and Ontologic

Beauty and Deformity of the Philosophic Sentiments; the Religious and Theologic Beauty and Deformity of the Religious Sentiments; the Moral and Political Beauty and Deformity of the Moral Sentiments; and many species of Psychologic Beauty and Deformity in the Intellect and Affection; and it is only by recognizing these divisions of the Mind, each with its distinct order of intelligence, and these opposite ideal principles as typical psychologic causes, that we can explain the phenomena of Philosophy, Religion, and Politics; of art, consciousness, and life.

Art is a universal intellectual form or organon conceived and constructed by the understanding, which we conceive to be constituted an intellectual totality through and in which Truth-Good-Beauty, on the one hand, and Falsehood-Evil-Deformity, on the other, become incarnated in Thought. The intellect is the great laboratory of thought, an incorporating sphere in which all ideals, laws, and phenomena realized by the Reason and by the Sentiment (which constitute the spirit and soul of the mental organization) are incarnated in sensible images and forms of thought founded in intellectual experience—an experience of which sensation is the external and material element, intuition the internal and individual element, inspiration and reflection the universal and creative elements. It is necessary that this incarnation and definition in thought should be realized before the rational and sentimental ideals, laws, and phenomena (which constitute the highest sphere of human intelligence and knowledge) can be intellectually comprehended or understood even by the creative mind itself or be communicated from one mind to another, and by other minds be either apprehended through external representation or be understood through reproductive reflection. We conceive that this intellectual totality is constituted in the tri-individual form of spirit, soul, and body, corresponding with the form of the entire human mind and with the entire personality of man; and that these three spheres of intellectual realization are personified by three great intellectual incarnating powers, Imagination and Fancy and Technics, which are the constructors of the spirit and the soul and the body of Thought, of its universal and its individual and its material elements and departments.

It has been very common among writers on art to separate certain forms of art from intellectual consciousness, but this error arises in false views of the nature of thought (that is, of intellectual consciousness), by which it is confined to the logical form of thought, and the laws of logic are identified with the laws of thought; thus excluding the Imagination, with its analogies, from the intellectual nature, of which it is the highest and most important factor; as well as excluding the Fancy (with its external and unreal similitudes and resemblances), which is, of all intellectual faculties, the most prolific in thought. Some have gone so far as to identify thought and language, thus excluding from the Intellect all except linguistic forms of thought. But it must be borne in mind that language, though an important instrument in the expression and definition of thought, is only one form of thought, and that there are many forms of thought in Art and Science and Industry that are not and cannot be expressed in language. All works of formative art (architecture, sculpture, painting) may be most definite forms of thought, as complete as are the literary arts of expression (language, poetry, music). Under this identification of thought and language, much of the arts of religion and government would be erroneously excluded from thought.

Some writers would confine the experience of art to the emotions and feelings, excluding thought. But the highest artistic experience cannot be realized without artistic thought as well as artistic feeling. Neither the artist who creates nor the observer who may merely perceive can realize even artistic emotion without intellectual presentation; for it is the intellectual realization of the ideal content in a work of art (either apprehended or comprehended) that constitutes the real perception of it by the mind, and makes possible a true responsive emotion of the individual consciousness on the presentation to it of this mental perception. These writers may be misled through not recognizing the spontaneity of some forms of artistic thought, which are so contrary to logical thought as to give them the appearance of emotion—but emotion is an activity of the soul (not of the mind), is an act of individual consciousness coöperating with the artistic Sentiment and Intellect.

**ART IDEALS AND STANDPOINTS OF THOUGHT.** — An important requisite for the interpretation of human thought, including art, is a true theory of human intelligence and knowledge which shall provide for the recognition of the different types of consciousness and intellectual standpoint from which primordial being and the objective world are viewed, because ontology or the science of being must always furnish the basis of thought.

If we study the natural history of thought as we would study anything in Nature, with the idea of classifying its phenomena, we shall find that we can ordinate these phenomena under four ever-recurring types, resulting from distinct universal ideals and intellectual standpoints, which are founded upon different conceptions of primordial being, of the origin of the world, and of the relation of the world to primordial being: these are the theistic-supernatural, the natural, the material, and the nihilistic-supernatural ideals; and we have so named these ideals, because they respectively posit, as primordial being, the Personal God, Nature, Matter, and the Impersonal Nothing. These ideals must always persist in human thought, and always conflict: they are the great psychologic personages who construct and destroy civilization.

The two great realms of consciousness are the theistic-supernatural, which is the Extreme Right, and the nihilistic-supernatural, which is the Extreme Left: these are founded on constructive and destructive root-principles which constitute the opposite poles of this universe of intelligence and of thought. The positions midway between these opposites are the natural standpoint, which is the Right Centre of consciousness, and the material standpoint, which is the Left Centre; and these midway positions are merely half-way houses on the way from dormant or diseased constructive-supernatural root-principles to those which are radically and offensively destructive. We have so often seen the road travelled, in all times and in all countries, but especially in our century, that we cannot be in doubt (if we at all regard the teaching of history) that, after leaving the camp of the extreme right, the theistic-supernatural realm of consciousness, there is but one road, that which leads to the nihilistic-supernatural, or the extreme left. This is clearly evident to all, in political life, as organized in the popular assembly of every nation; for they all



are alike in including parties representative of these types of political thought, which are only special forms of the universal points of view here presented. We may see these same types, related in the same order of mental progress, in philosophy and religion, in the literary arts, and in the formative arts, based on these separate ideals and standpoints.

These persisting types of knowledge and points of view are exclusive of each other, are found always in conflict, and always reproduce after their kinds in distinct lines of historic development, each with its limitations and well-defined principles. These types or standpoints of intelligence are psychologic norms which form different genera and species of knowledge, each of which claims dominion in the universe of thought, and all of which are needed to cover the diversity of human experience, and have shown their psychologic right to exist by their persistence in human history. The first requisite for understanding the significance of any phenomenon is to classify it under its generic and specific norm of ideality and thought, and thus know the principle which has caused it.

All attempts to interpret the phenomena of human thought and experience as the historic manifestation of one principle and one system of ideas—or as the failures and the more or less successful attempts to actualize any one general principle and system of ideas—are utterly groundless and lead to confusion of thought, because these phenomena are produced by the causative operation of these several classes of ideality, which are fundamental norms of human nature, standpoints of consciousness, and psychologic causes that are antagonistic and exclusive of each other, and each of which attains its own significant manifestation. The true method of interpretation of the history of human experience is to conceive these ideals and connect them with their manifestation in generic and specific types of thought. It is by this means alone that relative order can be produced in the chaos and conflict of natural manifestation; while the result of applying to this chaos the law of monism is to destroy the significance of words and ideas and to confound language.

Dualism and discretion are laws of the natural world; and the history of thought can be explained only by recognizing these op-

posite genera and several species, each of which has distinct and different ideals of consciousness, species of knowledge, and laws of certitude, and includes a conscious aim to actualize its own ideal, as distinct from every other, in its corresponding type of thought. These ideals possess appropriate characteristics, limitations, and boundaries; and they are called points of view or standpoints in the consciousness because they are distinct kinds of mental eyes through which, or according to the perceptive laws and power of which, all things are contemplated. Some one of these classes of consciousness dominates every historic epoch and each individual, marks and names the total condition—the kind of development and perceptive power of all the mental faculties—and predetermines the knowledge and opinions of this epoch and this individual in all spheres of thought. This is so true that, given the mental standpoint and consistency of thought, one may predict the intellectual conclusion or judgment on any subject; in fact, the conclusion is necessitated to follow from the point of view of the ideal of causality, conception of reality, and theory of knowledge which constitute this standpoint.

We find both subjective and historic evidence of the existence of these psychologic types, because these separate orders of human consciousness spread throughout the mental organization, and constitute a four-fold possibility or potentiality in each department of the mind. These kinds of perception and judgment are distinct, do not merge into but conflict with each other. If I interrogate my own consciousness, I find them all there; and I find that the chief disturbances of my peace of mind arise from the conflict carried on between these types of intelligence in my own mind; and that, when my supernatural intelligence operates, my experience is of an order entirely different from that of my natural intelligence, over which it is continually called to maintain its supremacy—different in its objects and in its laws and in its kind of knowledge, different in its point of view and in its method of thought. At times, my natural as well as my material consciousness asserts itself in opposition to my supernatural consciousness and belief, which at this time may be weak or in abeyance; and I clearly recognize this state of weakness and scepticism, and

the complete analogy of this temporary and partial condition of my own consciousness with the permanent and controlling presence of these natural and material types of consciousness in other persons, where one of these types has a supreme and even unimpeded operation (as in the natural man and the material man), bounding the mental horizon of these persons with an exclusiveness of other standpoints which convinces them that these other points of vision have no reality and therefore do not exist.

If we investigate the history of thought, we find that these standpoints are the psychologic personages who rule the affairs of men; and that the reality of interpretation of any period depends on the true conception of the point of view from which its characteristic experiences are realized, and in the light of which it interprets the world of thought and experience, both past and present. One of these standpoints so predominantly characterizes every period of the history of a people as to constitute a distinct type of civilization. In estimating any work of art, we should get at the universal ideal and intellectual standpoint from which the work is constructed; for this will enable us to rank it, will give unity to our interpretation of it, enable us to explain it by itself and to detect its inconsistencies. It is the same, whatever be the subject under consideration; whether it be philosophy, religion, politics, or any of the kinds of literary or of formative art. By this classification we may give reality (though relative) and place to every species of experience that has been established in the historic order of civilization; we may conceive the ideal meaning and artistic type of each species, characterize it, and recognize its factorship in the successive development of the human consciousness.

The philosopher truly says: "A work of art is made what it is by its ideal content." Now, what does this mean? It means that the ideal which the artist had in mind (and which he incorporates in thought in order to define it to himself and to present it to other minds) constitutes the causative principle of this work of art; and that the artistic form with which he clothes this ideal is the external means by which the ideal is expressed in actuality—is defined in thought to his own intelligence, is com-

municated to the minds of other men, and comes into the consciousness of all capable of perceiving it.

This ideal content may be of different orders of thought. I. The artist may have in mind only material motives and ideas to express, and either to imitate the external appearance of things or to conceive the material ideal of the species, and the unactualized possibilities of material natures—to consider merely the material structure, qualities, and functions of things. The artist thus produces a form of material art (whether ideal or imitative and realistic) which treats his subject (even the human subject) as merely a body, as to its very entity—whether he present the actual appearance of things or the material ideal and possibilities of the species—in conformity with the axiom of the materialist: *Everything that appears to the senses and the material consciousness is real; and everything that really is so appears.*

II. The artist may have in mind a naturalistic motive or idea to express, and to represent either the apparent nature of objects (some actual natural experience or observation of mind) or some unactualized form of natural consciousness, in a corresponding artistically expressive physical form; that is, either to express the internal and psychologic appearance of things or to conceive the natural ideal of the species, their individual and characteristic structure, qualities, and functions; and thus to produce a form of individual, naturalistic, psychic art, which treats his subject as a natural soul, possessing only a natural constitution and consciousness, the appearances of which are conceived to be identical with its reality—thus conforming to the axiom of the naturalistic standpoint: *Everything that appears to the natural consciousness is real; and everything that really is appears to the natural consciousness.* This is the pseudo-rationalistic standpoint.

III. The artist may have in mind ideas of universal or of supernatural significance, ideas of ontology and theology, of absolute being and the spiritual relations of man; or he may represent the supernatural side of human nature, either its actualities or the possibilities involved in it, conceiving some unactualized supernatural capacity of man; that is, he may express the philosophic reality of things, their ideal structure, qualities, and functions, and thus produce a form of universal art which treats

his subject primarily as a supernatural or representative-spiritual being, possessing a supernatural nature and consciousness, the reality of which consists in its relation with and consciousness of supernatural and spiritual existence—in conformity with the axiom of the supernaturalist: *All reality and truth are in supernatural and spiritual existence, and in either the supernatural or the spiritual consciousness, which are foolishness to the natural and material mind.* As the supernatural appears in opposite generic ideals (the theistic and the nihilistic), we find four species or kinds of art, produced from distinct ideals and standpoints, which must always persist in human history; and we may classify all works of art under these four heads, as characterized by one or other of these ideals.

These four standpoints of human consciousness appear in the history of thought, sometimes alone, sometimes side by side, sometimes in successive manifestation. In successive supremacy, they appear in each cycle of development in the order of enumeration, beginning with the theistic-supernatural ideal on a plane of consciousness higher than it reached in the preceding period, thereby realizing that general progress which is necessary to a state of civilization. Thus—though the law of development in this cycle is that of degeneration from the theistic-supernatural (1) to the natural, (2) to the material, and (3) to the nihilistic-supernatural ideal, while in each of these periods there is a special degeneration in the development of each type—in the general cycle the law of birth and of revelation produces the regeneration and elevation of the consciousness and life on a higher plane of experience. We find, then, in the history of every one of the products of human intelligence—in Art (from philosophy to painting), in Science, and in Industry—these four general ideals, for we find in man himself these theistic-supernatural, natural, material, and nihilistic-supernatural types of consciousness; and each individual is characterized by the supremacy of some one of them, which thus constitutes the general standpoint from which he contemplates all things. The most intelligent and clear-headed men are those in whom one of these types pervades and characterizes his entire mental constitution, giving him an innate unity of vision and consistency of thought. Furthermore, we must expect that

these distinct types of consciousness will persist so long as humanity exists: they will always conflict, and the most so when in their normal and healthiest condition. If any one of them appears to come to an end, it is only dormant for a season and will return to activity and reproduction at its appointed time. All attempts at fusion by demolishing these landmarks of thought mark the temptation of Naturalism and Materialism and Nihilism addressed to a weakened and demoralized theistic-supernatural insight.

The principal cause of conflict and confusion in thought is the failure to recognize and distinctly conceive the theistic-supernatural and the nihilistic-supernatural as opposite generic standpoints and psychologic causes, and to recognize their self-consistency and their necessary persistence in thought, and therefore their right to exist in this natural world of opposites. This endless conflict is increased by the failure to recognize the supernatural, natural, and material ideals as separate and specific standpoints and normal types of thought; by the failure to see the partial character of actual experience; and by the claim that each standpoint makes—that its own ideal is generic and universal and covers the entire ground of reality. This self-assertion of one or of another partial ideal claiming to cover the whole ground of reality in thought carries with it the denial of all reality to other species of consciousness. Relative peace in the intellectual arena can be made only by recognizing distinct genera and species in the kingdom of consciousness and of thought; genera and species which are quite as distinct as are those in the human, animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms; and which as distinctly propagate under laws of generic and specific continuity, increase and multiplication, each producing its like in the world of ideas; each having a definitely limited field, denying the reality of its neighboring genus and species, and making continual effort to destroy it. Conflict, war, extermination is the law of life to these ideals and standpoints of thought; yet they all must continue to exist in order to furnish an environment, a spirit, and a specific form for the inevitable and continuous reproduction of these types of human consciousness in this world of partial experience, of unreal life, of discordant thought: *i. e.*, it is a natural world in which we exist. The maintenance of the conflict is a sign of

generic and specific vitality in each; and the drawing together of differing opinions now to be observed is a sign of indifference or of blindness, not of real union; because, in reality, these points of view are mutually exclusive, and this drawing together is the result of loss of separative insight and of reality in thought. The contest between Theism and Nihilism is radical to life, and their pseudo-union in Liberalism is a sign either of torpidity, or of death to a Theism already devitalized by a pervading Pantheism.

We find all these four points of view in disorderly manifestation during certain transitional epochs preceding new psychic births, such as those of the Christian era, of the Protestant period, and of the present century, when the new type of civilization has not yet been constructed, while the old types are losing their hold upon the people through loss of vitality in institutions and loss of insight by the people. This complex and disorderly manifestation must continue until the new constructive ideal has reconstituted social institutions, and comparative order has become established in the universe of thought. These periods of transition can be interpreted only by recognizing the presence of different and conflicting types of thought, which persist historically in continuous intellectual species, but which at such periods come into the consciousness with renewed perception and activity, greater intensity and insistence, and more expanded development. Although these four ideals are mutually exclusive and never unite in a single act of real consciousness, and though the theistic-supernatural is in conflict with the three other ideals, yet, in these transitional epochs, the nihilistic-supernatural ideal forms a coalition with the natural and material ideals, because it is (unconsciously to them) the causative principle of their common opposition to Theism. The nihilistic-supernatural ideal thus uses the natural and material ideals and types of civilization with their gradually disintegrating forms of intellectualism (rationalism, doubt, criticism, and skepticism), in its destructive work and in its efforts to establish a pessimistic humanity on the ruins of theistic civilization, whether this humanity take the form of the *bête humaine* of the material ideal or of the *diable humain* of the destructive-supernatural ideal. It is only by a new birth of the theistic-supernatural ideal and the reconstruction of Christian

civilization, as the City of God, that any real opposition can be made against this material Babel, or City of Satan.

As we find in the dominant philosophy of our time either a realistic materialism or a transcendental pessimism—so, in literary and formative art (especially in poetry and fiction and painting), we find a preternatural realism of the ignoble and the horrible side of human nature, which educates and develops the Satanic image in man. Hitherto the mission of the art of our century, from Philosophy to Painting, has been to educate and develop this destructive side of the human constitution as well as the lower phases of its possible experience; and the only way that art can be reborn onto a higher plane and again become the handmaid of the Christian religion, is that Christianity itself should be born from on high and again enlighten the world of humanity with the reflected light of God—then shall Truth-Good-Beauty, the image of the Divine Logos, again become the ideal in art from Philosophy to Painting, and the representative Kingdom of God be again established on the earth.

**DEFINITION OF ART.**—Before attempting a positive definition of Art, we will refer to some of the imperfect definitions still accepted in æsthetic circles. 1. The definition (held by so many), that art is a representation, in sensible forms, of ideas of sublimity and beauty and the picturesque, is not adequate, because the larger half of art is an embodiment of the principles of the horrible, of deformity, of the grotesque, and with greater artistic and subjective reality. 2. It is not specific to art, to say (with Hegel) that it is “the union of the objective and subjective in the human spirit . . something inward, a content, and something outer which has that content as its significance.” This definition is too broad, for it does not distinguish art from every fact of existence: every actuality of life has an internal and an external, a subjective and objective element. 3. It is not the object of all art to give pleasure (as some tell us), for the aim of a great body of works of art is to cause pain—such as terror of destructive force, and the pain excited by the representation of death and misfortune in tragedy; while some (like the social arts and many of the higher forms of art) give satisfaction or pleasure to some and pain to others. 4. The school which makes art to be only subjective, and denies



its objective reality, removes its civilizing function and misrepresents its very nature, for art is the embodiment by the human mind of the objective reality of things both above and below itself, by means of its own subjective reality, symbolizing absolute and dissolutive reality, and realizing opposite relative reality, both actual and possible. 5. It is not a definition of art to say that it is idealism and symbolism (vs. naturalism), because, beside the art of symbolism, there is an art which is founded on naturalism and on romanticism; also an art that is founded on imitation and material realism. It is not defining art to identify it with imitation, for imitation is but the lowest function of the depraved type of art. 6. It is most untrue to say (with Edmund Burke): *No work of art can be great but as it deceives*, for this is the most superficial form even of realism. 7. It is not a true definition to make art consist in technic form, abolishing subject and ideal content (Schiller), for the ideal content is what makes it art, and gives it reality and universal significance. The definitions that art is the significant, the characteristic, the expressive, which are favorite definitions of modern writers, are both vague and insufficient, for two reasons: (1) because these terms are most suited to and are oftenest used to express only the individual element in art; (2) because no distinct art-principles are presented as the ground of reality (whether objective or subjective), and this presentation is necessary to a definition. Still, though vague and insufficient, the combined definition, that art is the significant, the characteristic, the expressive, would be nearer the truth than that which would make art and beauty to be equivalent terms, because the above terms apply to the art of the horrible, deformity, and the grotesque, as well as to the art of sublimity, beauty, and the picturesque. But it would be far from a true definition to identify the characteristic, the significant, the expressive with beauty, for the art of deformity includes these attributes as well, and much more so, as being nearer to the internal nature of man. Expression, characterization, ideal significance, all must be recognized in art; but, even then, we are far from a definition of art, for the reason that there are opposite art-principles, and that such terms as would truly apply to both of these opposites are necessarily few and vague. The definition of art must include

the presentation of these opposite principles in distinctly separate ideals: first, of the ontologic principles which constitute the objective reality of art; second, of the psychic principles which constitute its subjective reality in the human mind.

Art is the universal organon for the representation (in intellectual form, or in thought) of the total ideality of existence, both actual and potential. This total ideality of existence includes that network of principles of the unseen universe which constitutes its complex system of causality; those principles of many different orders which are the secondary causative agents in the world's productive and destructive operations; and it is the mission of art to incorporate these principles, apart from their complexity, conflicts, and confused manifestations in the natural world, so as to exhibit them in ideal and sensible form according to their single operation and normal relations. Art thus presents the total ideal capacity of the race in the various spheres of its activity: it is the supreme mode of bringing into definite and effective consciousness the highest as well as the lowest ideal capacities of the human mind: the capacity for the supernatural (or for the things above it in the scale of existence), for the natural (or for the things of its own nature), and for the material (or for the things below it): the capacity for the highest and the lowest truth-good-beauty, and for the highest and the lowest falsehood-evil-deformity—those great psychologic opposites which contest the possession of the soul and produce its regeneration or degeneration on all planes of its experience. Art is thus an objective ideal world in communion with the subjective ideal world in the mind of man: it has reality both outside the mind, as object, and within the mind, as subjective experience. As object, it is realized under its own general laws as the highest individuality in civilization, which operates upon the human race in its historic development, in its regeneration and in its degeneration. The subjective ground of art is in the dual roots of the mental organization, which are found primarily and in their most concentrated form in the opposite principles of the Reason, which is the spirit of the mind. These opposite principles are truth-good-beauty and falsehood-evil-deformity; and their ideals become ensouled and incorporated in the lower departments of the mind

—in the *Philosophic, Religious, and Moral Sentiments*, in the *Thought of the Intellect*, and in the *Feeling of the Affection*. This subjective ideality in the mind is the basis of the creative power of the artist, the basis of taste and of judgment, and of the ability to see in works of real art (from philosophy to painting) their ideal nature and significance, as distinguished from their merely natural and sensual appearance. This mental susceptibility to the ideality of the objective world and of absolute causes, and this artistic creative power, constitute an innate ideal capacity in the mind which arises in the microcosmic character of man's nature. The same realities which are imaged or symbolized in the great created cosmos, the macrocosmos (these realities being the absolute cosmos, God, and the dissolutive chaos or acosmos, the Nothing), are imaged or symbolized in the mental organization and consciousness of man, who is the small created cosmos, the microcosmos. These primary images and the analogic relations between God (the creative cosmos), the Nothing (the decreative chaos), the Universe (the created macrocosm), and man (the created microcosm) constitute the ideal basis of art, both objective and subjective; and to perceive and incorporate in thought these integral images and relations is the highest mission of art.

**MISSIONS OF ART.**—Art has three missions: it is historic, interpretive, creative. I. The first mission of art is historic—it is to perpetuate or place in permanent form and preserve for the instruction of the present and of future generations the essential manifestations of man's individual and collective ideal experience, to operate not only as records, but also as suggestive material in the ideal conception of human nature and of its unrealized possibilities. Art, in its historic mission, thus incarnates in sensible form the changes of actual life, the temporary and passing conditions, ideas, and essential manifestations of humanity in all spheres of experience—whether universal and supernatural, or individual and natural, or material and sensual; so that future humanity may not be confined, for the sources of its knowledge, to present experience (which constitutes but a small section of the circle of human life); but that humanity may work from the basis of civilization and of the world's history, being able to realize the actuality of the past as an ideal conception of the artistic faculty, even

when the individual would not be able to realize this actuality as a personal experience—for his artistic faculty enables him to see it from an impersonal point of view.

Art thus preserves the types of such high orders of human experience as human genius is incapable of realizing in periods of degradation, when Materialism and Atheism flood the human mind, and Realism governs its artistic products. In these periods, art is the ark in which are preserved the sacred ideal types, that they may again serve as suggestion and stimulus to human thought, when the flood shall have subsided and the fields of human nature shall again bring forth by a new creation from on high—when the dormant seeds of the higher fruits of human intelligence shall again germinate and bring forth fruit, and reproduce, each after its kind, in the reconstruction of Christian civilization on a higher plane of experience.

II. The second mission of art is interpretive—it is to make clear to thought the ideal significance of human realization, of the actualities or realized possibilities of human nature: to bring to light and emphasis the ideal principle and cause involved or centred in concrete manifestation; to present the reality of things which is behind their appearance—the hidden meaning which is concealed from the eyes of common sense; and to separate the opposite ideals which are found mixed in concrete nature, and present them as distinct intellectual individualities, with their corresponding laws and phenomena. This function of art applies to both past and present realization. It is most important in its interpretation of the universal ideals of the past and of the corresponding special types of thought; intellectual types which the present consciousness may be incapable of realizing as a personal experience, but which may be ideally reconceived by the artistic mind, and which are useful for suggestion and stimulus at those periods of new birth in the human consciousness when, in the revolution of the universe of thought, these ideals of the past again return into the consciousness to be incorporated in intellectual forms which shall correspond, as to progress, with the new birth of the mind and soul. This renewed perception of old ideals is accompanied by the creation of new types of thought and by new forms of individual experience; and these constitute a starting-point in the new circle of revolution, as humanity (under

the law of circularity) again passes over the same ideal longitude on a higher plane of consciousness-activity-life.\*

III. The third and highest mission of art is creative—it is to conceive and to incorporate in adequate sensible form the unactualized possibilities of human nature. These are of three kinds of ideality, and require three different kinds of artistic mental power, which are represented by the man of Talent, the man of Genius, the man of Inspiration. 1. *The man of Talent and of Fancy*, through a fictitious ideality, creates those fanciful and ephemeral forms of art which attribute to things fictitious qualities, and institute fantastic relations, founded on superficial and apparent resemblances—comparing things that internally are either in discord or are without any real relationship. 2. *The man of Genius and of Imagination*, with intuitive insight into generic and specific law and relation, creates those natural and material ideals and their corresponding forms of art which present the ideal of the species—the natural types of things that the original genius has seen lying dormant in the natural man and in Nature. 3. *The Inspired Artist and man of Reason*, with prophetic vision of eternal truths, sees the universal principles of Being, Non-being, and Becoming; sees in Becoming Existence the analogies with Being and Non-being, and creates those universal institutions which represent these truths and preside over the development of man; he creates those works of art which represent superhuman causes and the relations of man to these causes, incorporating in the intellectual symbolism of the Imagination the supernatural intuitions and conceptions of the Reason and the Sentiment. The inspired creative artist is a seer, and the pioneer in the supernatural history of man: he sees the possibilities of humanity and awakens in man his dormant perception and faculty. In all constructive periods of civilization the inspired creative artist—whether he be philosopher, priest, or governor; philologist, poet, or musician; architect, sculptor, or painter—conceives and presents the norm of possible experience, and the apprehensive mass

\* Such a new birth was realized at the Christian era, and again at the Protestant era; and another is to be expected in our time, as Protestant civilization appears to have run its course in the most advanced portion of civilized peoples. The historic churches of Saints Peter and Paul (Catholic and Protestant) having fulfilled their historic mission, we may now look for a new civilization which shall follow the gospel of St. John, and complete our cycle of historic Christianity on this earth.

of the people respond to this presentation and teaching by incorporating it in actual life. Thus, the highest category in the creative mission of art is to symbolize, in the natural world (with an ever-increasing distinctness and elevation as the circle of human experience revolves), that spiritual existence and those spiritual laws and ideas which cannot here be realized, but the representation of which is the vital element in the natural world and the medium of analogic relation with the spiritual. This sphere of representative-spiritual life we call supernatural, though it is necessarily an integral part of the natural constitution of created things : that which connects this constitution with its creator and with spheres of existence above itself.

With regard to the highest subjects of thought, we cannot, in the natural world, establish the simple and inflexible relations and the clear vision of spiritual science : symbolic thought, in its representation of spiritual truth-good-beauty is our nearest approach to it. It is analogic and idealistic thought that expresses this veiled vision of the Divine Logos, of which the True Reason of man is an image—the logical and realistic intellect of pseudo-rationalism is blind to this symbolism, which appeals to the imaginative intellect that created it. The logical intellect bruises its beauty with critical energy, pulls it to pieces to find out its mechanism, and contemplates the *débris* of its lifeless members with contempt, blind to the light and beauty which it has destroyed. But this is historic necessity—for, as change and particular degeneration are the invariable laws of the natural world, the inevitable result of historic succession (at the end of each great period) is to enthrone the logical and fantastic intellect, with its blind realism and its licentious fancy, in the holy places of the truth-good-beauty of the Reason and Sentiment and Imagination, which it occupies jointly with its master and ally and coöperator the nihilistic-supernatural, which is the self-conscious exponent of Falsehood-Evil-Deformity. Thank God, the natural law of universal progress is equally invariable, and we may faithfully trust that humanity will be born again from on high, and the supernatural eyes of man be again opened to the Truth-Good-Beauty of the Kingdom of God.

ARTHUR L. FROTHINGHAM, Senior.

Princeton, N. J.